

AV 98  
DSC (02) 8  
Original: English



## **NATO Parliamentary Assembly**

# **THE WAR AGAINST TERRORISM**

## **DRAFT SPECIAL REPORT**

***JOHN SHIMKUS (UNITED STATES)***  
***SPECIAL RAPPORTEUR\****

International Secretariat

2 May 2002

---

\* Until this document has been approved by the Defence and Security Committee, it represents only the views of the Rapporteur.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	MILITARY CAMPAIGN IN AFGHANISTAN .....	3
III.	CO-OPERATION IN FIGHTING TERRORISM .....	4
	A. NATO'S INSTITUTIONAL ROLE .....	4
	B. OVERVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS .....	5
	C. CONTRIBUTIONS BY NATO ALLIES .....	7
	D. CONTRIBUTIONS BY NON-NATO COUNTRIES .....	9
IV.	NEXT STEPS IN THE WAR AGAINST TERRORISM .....	11
V.	NATO'S ROLE IN FIGHTING TERRORISM .....	14
VI.	CONCLUSION .....	16

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

1. On September 11, 2001, terrorists from the al-Qaeda network hijacked four American jetliners and used them as fuel-laden bombs against American civilian and government targets. Two aircraft crashed into the twin towers of the World Trade Centre in New York, killing more than 3,000 people from dozens of countries around the world, collapsing the towers themselves, and destroying much of the infrastructure of lower Manhattan. A third aircraft crashed into the Pentagon in Arlington, Virginia, killing more than 100 people and destroying a large section of that building, home to the US Department of Defence. A fourth aircraft crashed in rural Pennsylvania after passengers apparently overpowered the hijackers, who were believed headed for another government target in Washington.

2. As millions in the United States, allied countries, and elsewhere around the world watched the stark scenes unfolding before their eyes, it became clear that we all faced a new enemy. At NATO headquarters, Secretary General George Robertson recognised that the events of September 11 constituted an act of war against the United States, and therefore against the entire Alliance. On September 12, the permanent representatives on the North Atlantic Council agreed with the Secretary General's suggestion that Article 5 of the Washington Treaty be invoked if it were determined that the attacks were directed from abroad. The NATO nations had declared that the Alliance had been attacked, and each ally pledged to aid the United States by taking "such action as it deems necessary."

3. Within days, the list of suspects was narrowed to one terrorist organisation – the al-Qaeda network, based in Afghanistan, but with cells all over the world. By early October, the evidence was clear and compelling that al-Qaeda had orchestrated the attacks, and NATO accordingly confirmed that Article 5 was indeed applicable. On October 7, military action began in Afghanistan against al-Qaeda and the unrecognised Taliban regime that harboured the organisation and its leader, Osama bin Laden. More than 50 years after its founding in the depths of the Cold War, NATO was at war – not with the Soviet Union or any other state, but against a terrorist organisation and the regime that gave it shelter.

4. September 11 was the first time that al-Qaeda had carried out an attack on American soil, but it was only the latest and bloodiest in a decade of attacks on American targets worldwide. According to the Congressional Research Service (CRS), a branch of al-Qaeda is believed responsible for a 1992 bombing of a Yemeni hotel where American service members were staying. Bin Laden claimed he armed Somali forces who fought US troops in 1993, and the group is believed responsible for a 1995 bombing of a US military facility in Saudi Arabia that killed one US citizen, four other US government employees and more than 40 others, and the 1998 bombings of US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania that killed 301 people. Al-Qaeda also attacked the American navy ship USS Cole in Aden in 2000, killing 17 US sailors. The group reportedly planned attacks tied to the millennium celebrations in Los Angeles and Jordan that were foiled.

5. While the events of September 11 were shocking, they were not unforeseen. Many observers of the international scene in the 1990s had pointed out the risk that international terrorism – the deliberate targeting of civilians to achieve a political goal -- posed to our nations and our societies, and top-level commissions repeated the warning. Most notably, the 1999 Hart-Rudman Commission in the United States, led by former Senators Gary Hart and Warren Rudman, bluntly stated: "Americans will likely die on American soil, possibly in large numbers." And their report foreshadowed the horrific nature of the current conflict: "We should expect conflicts in which adversaries, because of cultural affinities different from our own, will resort to forms and levels of violence shocking to our sensibilities."

6. Likewise, NATO was well-aware of the threat that international terrorism posed to the homelands of its members. The 1999 Strategic Concept, approved by the newly enlarged 19-member Alliance at the April 1999 Washington Summit, contains a clear statement that: "Alliance security interests can be affected by other risks of a wider nature, including acts of terrorism ..." More broadly, that document points to threats in addition to terrorism, such as the proliferation of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons, organised crime, and "disruption of the flow of vital resources," and it calls for the allies to maintain forces capable of deterring "any potential aggression against it."

7. The US Congress had also been forthright and candid about the need for NATO to confront new threats. During the February 2000 meetings in Brussels, Rep. Douglas Bereuter told this Committee "that Europeans should support US-led operations which are distant from Europe that combat terrorism and WMD proliferation and protect access to resources if the US is to continue to join crisis management operations, such as quelling ethnic conflict in Europe."

8. It is important to emphasize that the military campaign is only one part in the war against terrorism. We do not face a traditional enemy, nor a traditional struggle. Most notably, terrorists do not have a state that we can isolate and defeat. We have replaced the Taliban regime in Afghanistan, but we have not yet defeated terrorism. We must target the financial network that nourishes terrorist groups. We must work diplomatically to enlist other countries' help in this struggle and to ensure that we can consolidate the victories we achieve militarily, as well as continuing our diplomatic efforts to isolate those countries that harbour terrorists or fund their activities. We must coordinate law enforcement efforts so that the terrorists operating in our own countries are brought to justice and prevented from carrying out future attacks. We must marshal all of our technological knowledge to protect our own technological infrastructure and to detect potential terrorist actions before they are carried out. We must improve and coordinate our use of intelligence and covert operations to dissolve terrorist organisations. And we must help change the social and economic conditions that help breed radicalism and fanaticism.

9. While your Rapporteur acknowledges the broad nature of this struggle, he will limit his report to examining the military campaign. He intends this report as one part of a comprehensive package that the Assembly will produce on the war against terrorism. He looks forward to reading the work that the other committees will produce with regard to the other aspects of this campaign. While he will unavoidably touch on these other dimensions, he will undertake to minimize duplication with the reports of the other committees.

10. In addition, your Rapporteur calls the attention of his colleagues to the General Report of Pierre Lellouche, of France. Mr Lellouche's report contains a thorough analysis of the threats that face Alliance homelands, particularly from terrorism and ballistic missiles, and it highlights the dangers posed by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the possibility that they might be used against our countries. That report will focus on the capabilities needed to meet these threats, in a more general sense.

11. This report, then, will concentrate on the ongoing military campaign against terrorism, stemming from the September 11 attacks. It will begin with an overview of the campaign against the al-Qaeda network and the Taliban in Afghanistan. It will examine the co-operation that the United States has received from its NATO allies and from other countries that are assisting the fight against terrorism. It will then examine possible next phases in the war on terrorism, a war that is not limited to al-Qaeda. Finally, this report will look at how NATO countries might improve their abilities to act together against terrorism before offering some final conclusions.

## **II. MILITARY CAMPAIGN IN AFGHANISTAN**

12. On October 7, 2001, as this Committee was concluding its meeting in Ottawa, American aircraft based on carriers and elsewhere in the region initiated a bombing campaign over Afghanistan, signalling the start of the US counterattack against al-Qaeda and the Taliban regime that sheltered it. The ensuing campaign against the Taliban inspired doubts at first, but the precipitous collapse of their regime quickly quieted the naysayers. The Taliban were driven from Kabul, the capital, the night of November 12, and by December 6 they had lost control of the country, save a few isolated mountain pockets. The international community organised an interim government under the leadership of Hamid Karzai that took power in December, the same month that an international peacekeeping force was organised in Kabul.

13. According to Marine Lt. Gen. Michael DeLong, the deputy commander in chief of US Central Command, "What went down in Afghanistan went down the way it was supposed to: It was hard-hitting, it was lethal, and we got rid of al-Qaeda." A major part of the campaign was unconventional warfare, working with anti-Taliban forces and using special operations troops to identify bombing targets. Those efforts enabled conventional marine and army units to establish a forward base in Afghanistan. Ultimately, Central Command officials said, the military campaign will give way to a civilian operation to stabilise the country and "prevent this from ever happening again."

14. Noting the unusual nature of the campaign, Steve Hadley, the deputy national security adviser to President George W. Bush, said, "We had special forces on horseback calling in bombing strikes to support a cavalry charge by our Afghan allies. That's not the type of warfare they trained for at West Point (the US Military Academy)."

15. During this Committee's visit to his headquarters in Tampa, Florida, Gen. Charles Holland, commander in chief of US Special Operations Command, and his staff provided details on the role of special forces in the campaign. They were able to infiltrate successfully into Afghanistan, where they served as a liaison between the anti-Taliban Northern Alliance and US forces, particularly useful in linking coalition airpower to Northern Alliance ground attacks. At the same time, the special forces were able to build a rapport with the local forces on the ground. Northern Alliance commanders, familiar with their adversary, provided those forces with lists of targets that the American forces could pass on for future air strikes to aircraft based in neighbouring countries in Central Asia, on aircraft carriers in the Arabian Sea, on the British island of Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean, and even in the continental United States.

16. Also noteworthy was the close co-ordination between the US military and paramilitary intelligence officers. In combating a shadowy adversary, small units of special operations forces and intelligence operatives can be effective in finding small groups of terrorists. When American special forces arrived in Afghanistan on October 19, intelligence operatives had already been on the ground for three weeks, working with Northern Alliance commanders. Meanwhile, in the air, intelligence-gathering aircraft have given US commanders real-time intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance information.

17. The close co-ordination between US special operations forces on the ground, local forces, and coalition air forces enabled the coalition to rout Taliban and al-Qaeda fighters with minimal casualties among coalition troops. The nature of the adversary and the nature of this fight are different than an operation like Kosovo, however, where NATO bombing forced Slobodan Milosevic to acquiesce to the Alliance's demands. A terrorist group is not a state with an infrastructure and society to protect, so when al-Qaeda terrorists took refuge in the mountains of eastern Afghanistan, the coalition was left with little choice but to send in ground troops.

18. On March 3, ground troops from the United States, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Norway and Australia began Operation Anaconda, designed to crush the remnants of al-Qaeda. In just over two weeks, coalition forces and their Afghan allies destroyed the last stronghold of the terrorist organisation, killing a significant number of their senior commanders and destroying ammunition and supplies, commanders said. Conventional army forces, including the US 101st Airborne and 10th Mountain divisions, played a leading role. Ground forces were able to flush al-Qaeda fighters from their caves into the open, where they could be attacked from the air by US and French fighter-bombers and American AC-130 gunships and A-10 attack planes. The operation was not without cost, however, as nine Americans died in combat.

19. While Operation Anaconda destroyed the remaining base of operations of al-Qaeda, it signalled yet another shift in the nature of this campaign. The small bands of al-Qaeda fighters who escaped are expected to mount small, guerrilla raids against coalition and Afghan government forces. Already, Taliban supporters are warning Afghans not to support the new regime, for example, distributing leaflets threatening those who are sending their children to school. In March, George Tenet, the US Director of Central Intelligence, told the Senate Armed Services Committee, "You're entering into another phase here that is more difficult because you're probably looking at smaller units who intend to really operate against you in a classic insurgency format." Vice Adm. Thomas Wilson, director of the Defence Intelligence Agency, described the likely attacks as "bridging the difference between terrorism and ... insurgent warfare." The intelligence officials said that the return of warmer weather in the spring would increase the likelihood that coalition forces will be attacked. It appears that coalition forces will be in Afghanistan for a while, and we must focus on how to use this time to build a lasting peace.

20. The success of the campaign in Afghanistan has surpassed the expectations of most observers. Coalition forces succeeded in driving the Taliban from power in less than two months, and the recent Operation Anaconda has destroyed the last major base of operation of al-Qaeda. While the United States led this campaign, scores of friends and allies lent immeasurable support, from countries that granted oversight rights to those who have land, sea and air forces fighting alongside American troops. The international contribution to the coalition against terrorism will be examined more closely in Chapter III. The future of the war on terrorism after Afghanistan will be the subject of inquiry in Chapter IV.

### **III. CO-OPERATION IN FIGHTING TERRORISM**

#### **A. NATO'S INSTITUTIONAL ROLE**

21. When the North Atlantic Council invoked Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, it did more than issue a ringing endorsement of political support for the United States in responding to the terrorist attacks. NATO and its individual member countries have responded to the Alliance's first collective-defence mission with concrete measures, helping to defend American territory, stepping up activity in Europe, and in many cases deploying land, sea and air forces to Afghanistan, neighbouring countries, and the Arabian Sea. The action of NATO allies and other international partners in the war on terrorism show that this is a global coalition.

22. "It's not just rhetorical support after Sept. 11, but real contributions," said Mr Hadley, the No. 2 official on the National Security Council staff. Mr Hadley said that NATO's declaration that the attacks against the United States fell under Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, NATO's collective defence clause, "was very important to the American people and the transatlantic relationship." Mr Hadley noted, "This is not a major conventional war that passed NATO by. By design, it has a small footprint. The NATO countries have made an appropriate contribution." However, these

contributions have been on a bilateral basis, as the Alliance itself currently has little ability to undertake a mission like Operation Enduring Freedom, a shortcoming addressed in Chapter V.

23. One cannot ignore the fact that NATO as an organisation has largely stood on the sidelines during this conflict. The integrated military command has not assumed command of NATO's first Article 5 operation, which is being run out of US Central Command in Tampa. Some critics have pointed to this arrangement as proof that NATO's days are numbered, wondering what role a military alliance has to play if its organisational structure is excluded from the conduct of the military campaign. They disregard that Article 5 itself pledges its members to assist the member that is attacked "by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force." Clearly, the authors of the Washington Treaty envisioned that military assistance might be provided to an ally outside the NATO structure.

24. The decision to run the war out of Central Command stems largely from the nature of the US command structure, rather than any lack of faith in NATO or the allies. The campaign in Afghanistan falls under the Central Command area of responsibility, which stretches from the Horn of Africa through the Middle East to Central Asia. Unlike in Europe, where the head of US European Command also serves as NATO's Supreme Allied Commander, Europe (SACEUR), the commander-in-chief of Central Command has no relationship to NATO. Had the source of the terrorist attacks been a country within the area of responsibility of European Command (which also includes much of Africa), one would expect that SACEUR and the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) would have played a far greater role in the conflict.

25. This is not to say that NATO is clearly up to the task of conducting a campaign like the one in Afghanistan. The experience of the 1999 Kosovo campaign, in which 19 allies had to sign off on targeting plans, showed that NATO can be a cumbersome mechanism for conducting a military campaign. It is not certain that a NATO-run campaign could have coped with the requirements of the Afghanistan campaign. For example, commanders described how multirole fighter aircraft would loiter over Afghanistan until intelligence assets identified a target for them to strike within a matter of minutes. Given the nature of targets in this campaign, terrorist leaders on the move rather than fixed infrastructure, it could not have been run in the same manner as Kosovo.

26. Wim van Eekelen, of the Netherlands, Rapporteur of the Sub-Committee on Transatlantic Defence and Security Co-operation, addresses some of the institutional challenges that NATO faces in his report, "The Transatlantic Defence Relationship after September 11." For NATO to be relevant to future collective defence, it must become capable of conducting operations like the one in Afghanistan. This will be an important issue at the Prague Summit this November, and your Rapporteur looks forward to the conclusions that Mr van Eekelen will reach and the decisions that will be taken by the Alliance at Prague.

## **B. OVERVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS**

27. More important, however, is the real military contribution that NATO allies and other coalition partners are making to the campaign in Afghanistan. General DeLong, the deputy commander in chief of US Central Command, noted that 15 of America's 18 NATO allies are participating in the campaign, and 11 NATO countries have forces on the ground in and around Afghanistan working with American forces, many of them small special forces units. "The United States has been smarter in dealing with the rest of the world," General DeLong said. "We have a close working relationship that is better than ever before."

28. Some countries have chosen to keep their contributions quiet for reasons of security or domestic politics. For example, German officials publicly criticised the Pentagon for disclosing in early March that German troops were participating in Operation Anaconda, along with forces from

Canada, Denmark, Norway and Australia. Other coalition partners have been similarly reticent, so the full extent of international co-operation is not available.

29. According to the US State Department, 23 countries were making facilities available for military operations, 89 countries had granted overflight rights, and 76 had granted landing rights. More than 100 countries had offered military forces, not all of which have been needed. According to General DeLong, 27 coalition partners were contributing 104 aircraft, more than 60 ships, and 14,000 of the 76,000 military personnel stationed in the theatre, most of them aboard ships in the region. Carrier battle groups have been contributed by the United Kingdom, France and Italy, and Japan has approved the deployment of escort ships, its first military contribution to an international coalition since World War II. Of the 5,000 coalition personnel in Afghanistan in January (a number that later peaked at 8,000), more than 1,000 were from coalition partners, General DeLong said. In addition to working side-by-side with American forces, coalition forces assisted the United States through their support to anti-Taliban forces, logistics assistance, intelligence, air strikes, and humanitarian assistance to the Afghan population. The report of Karl Lamers for the Sub-Committee on Transatlantic Relations of the Political Committee looks more closely at the diplomatic aspects of the war on terrorism.

30. Members of this Committee received a first-hand look at the extent of international co-operation in Operation Enduring Freedom at Central Command in February. Members visited the makeshift headquarters of the 27 nations that were contributing military assets to the campaign (a number that has since reached 30). Housed in 80 double-wide trailers parked next to Central Command headquarters at MacDill Air Force Base in Tampa, about 225 liaison officers coordinate their countries' efforts with Gen. Tommy Franks, the commander in chief of Central Command, who is the commander of Operation Enduring Freedom. Members spent almost an hour meeting with their national representatives in Tampa for confidential discussions of their country's role in the campaign against terrorism.

31. In the immediate aftermath of the terrorist attacks, NATO itself took several steps to offer military assistance to the United States. Most visibly, NATO sent 180 military personnel and five Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) aircraft to Tinker Air Force Base in Oklahoma to fly patrols over the United States. The NATO AWACS deployment freed American AWACS planes to deploy as part of Operation Enduring Freedom. The NATO AWACS planes have helped protect key infrastructure and assisted with presidential protection.

32. NATO itself has also offered assistance in planning for the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), the multinational peacekeeping mission in Kabul. NATO Secretary General George Robertson said that SHAPE, which routinely performs operational planning, could assist ISAF after Turkey takes over ISAF command from the United Kingdom, probably beginning in June. SHAPE planning for an operation in Afghanistan would mark the first time that the Alliance planned an operation outside of Europe and the first time that it planned a mission not under NATO command.

33. Other NATO military assistance includes permission to use bases, ports and airspace of all allies and sharing of intelligence information and resources. The Alliance has redeployed a nine-ship, eight-nation task force to the eastern Mediterranean to allow US ships in the region to participate in the Afghan campaign, and NATO countries have agreed to replace any American forces in the Balkans that might be needed for the war on terrorism.



### **C. CONTRIBUTIONS BY NATO ALLIES**

34. Individual allies have made significant contributions of land, sea and air forces. Regarding land forces, one of the most notable contributions has come from the United Kingdom, which has committed 1,700 Royal Marines from 3 Commando Brigade, a large percentage of the elite force of 7,500. That deployment is led by a 700-strong unit known as 45 Commando Royal Marines, which was backed by 1,000 troops from engineering, artillery, logistics and transport units.

35. Those troops, trained in fighting in cold weather and at high altitudes, were deployed in mid-April to the mountainous region along the Afghan-Pakistani border, where the remnants of al-Qaeda were believed to be hiding and moving between the two countries. Press reports indicate that Operation Ptarmigan, named after a mountain bird that changes colours with the seasons, was taking place in an area around an al-Qaeda and Taliban base that had been cleared once, but was the target of an enemy counter-offensive. Operation Ptarmigan was to be completed by the end of April, according to British military sources.

36. The deployment, however, has been criticised by some Members of Parliament from Prime Minister Tony Blair's own Labour Party. Some Labour MPs questioned the "line of command, the exit strategy and the intelligence" of the mission, while others simply expressed concern about "putting combat troops in a very dangerous position." Members of opposition parties also had questions about the deployment, requesting more details about the political objectives.

37. The United Kingdom has also deployed about three dozen warships to the region, which was described as the country's largest naval task force since the 1982 Falklands War. This deployment included an aircraft carrier with a squadron of Harrier jets and an assault ship with marines and army commandos aboard. British submarines have been involved in missile attacks against terrorist training facilities in Afghanistan.

38. In addition to its combat forces, the United Kingdom took the lead in organising ISAF, the multinational peacekeeping force in Kabul. About 1,500 British troops are committed to ISAF, and they took command of the force after it was created in December 2001.

39. Canada had more than 2,000 troops deployed to the region as of mid-April. According to Central Command, Canada was the first ally to deploy forces to the region. Canadian land forces, were deployed to the Kandahar area, where they were providing security for forces based near that former Taliban stronghold in southern Afghanistan. Some of those Canadian forces – it is unclear how many – participated in Operation Anaconda. In addition to the regular forces of the Light Infantry Battle Group, Canadian special operations forces "are currently in Afghanistan performing the full spectrum of missions," according to Central Command. As of mid-April, Canadian infantry forces had more than 800 personnel and 12 armoured reconnaissance vehicles based near Kandahar, where they were conducting regular operations against the remnants of al-Qaeda and the Taliban. Tragically, four Canadian soldiers were killed during a night-time training exercise in mid-April by an American F-16. This incident is under investigation. Sadly, casualties from friendly fire and accidents do occur in what Clausewitz called the "fog of war," but we must do all in our power to avoid such incidents at all costs.

40. In addition, Canada dedicated eight fighter aircraft to the common defence of North America, under the North American Aerospace Defence Command (NORAD). Canada deployed seven naval vessels, including a destroyer, supply ship, and frigates, in the Arabian Sea and Persian Gulf, conducting escort and surveillance operations. One strategic airlift plane and three theatre transports were assisting with supply and logistics, while two maritime patrol and surveillance aircraft were operating in the Persian Gulf.

41. More than 5,500 French military personnel were deployed in and around Afghanistan as of mid-April. France was providing significant air support from neighbouring countries and from a carrier battle group deployed in the Arabian Sea, flying more than 600 missions as of late March, with almost 4,000 hours of flying time. France had six Mirage 2000 D ground-attack fighters deployed at the Manas Air Base in Kyrgyzstan, along with three KC-135 tankers and a total of 450 personnel. Another two C-160 transports and 100 personnel were stationed in Dushanbe, Tajikistan. The carrier battle group, with 3,500 personnel, included Mirage IV aircraft flying reconnaissance missions, Super Etendard fighters on reconnaissance and ground-attack missions, and E-2C Hawkeye airspace surveillance planes. Super Etendard and Mirage 2000 aircraft flew combat missions in Operation Anaconda, striking 31 al-Qaeda targets over two weeks.

42. France had deployed 200 personnel to the northern Afghan city of Mazar e Sharif from December 2001 to February 2002, helping to secure that key city. Since then, a 500-strong battalion has been committed to the ISAF peacekeeping force in Kabul. At sea, in addition to supporting the carrier-based aircraft, French sailors were conducting maritime surveillance and counter-mine operations.

43. The German parliament in November 2001 authorised mobilisation of up to 3,900 troops for Operation Enduring Freedom, and Germany had 2,800 personnel in the theatre as of mid-April. As noted above, an estimated 100 German special operations forces took part in Operation Anaconda in March, and two German soldiers have died in the campaign. According to the German Ministry of Defence, 1,600 personnel were committed to Operation Enduring Freedom, with another 1,200 troops committed to ISAF. The German navy had three frigates, a five-ship fast patrol boat group, and four supply ships operating out of Djibouti, on the Gulf of Aden, where two Sea King helicopters and 140 paratroopers are also based. Three German maritime patrol aircraft were flying missions in the Indian Ocean out of Mombassa, Kenya. About 1,400 German personnel were based in the Horn of Africa region.

44. The Italian government committed 2,700 troops to Operation Enduring Freedom and ISAF, including an armoured regiment, reconnaissance and transport aircraft, naval vessels, and anti-biological and chemical weapons equipment. Italy had sent its only carrier battle group to the Arabian Sea, including eight Tornado strike fighters. In mid-March, Italy replaced that group with a naval force that includes a destroyer and a frigate. Italy also has a C-130 and Boeing 707 transport aircraft deployed to the air base at Manas, Kyrgyzstan.

45. Denmark deployed about 100 special operations forces to the theatre as part of a multinational unit under American command, and Danish ground forces participated in Operation Anaconda. Three Danes have been killed and three wounded in action. In addition, Denmark was providing a C-130 transport with 77 personnel, and the Danish air force was set to provide four F-16 fighters, pending identification of a suitable host base.

46. Norway also contributed special operations forces and hardened special operations vehicles to the coalition, and they participated on the ground in Operation Anaconda. Norwegian C-130 transport aircraft are supplying Norwegian and coalition forces, and Norway was planning to send fighter aircraft to Manas Air Base in Kyrgyzstan. Norway was also active in mine-clearing operations in Afghanistan.

47. Turkey in November 2001 deployed 90 special forces soldiers to Afghanistan, primarily to train anti-Taliban Afghan forces and support humanitarian aid. Since then, Turkey has contributed about 260 troops to ISAF and agreed in late April to assume command of the force, probably beginning in June. Turkey has also provided KC-135 tanker aircraft for refuelling support for American aircraft flying into the theatre. Two Turkish air bases were used for air operations.

48. Among the other allies, the Netherlands contributed 220 troops to ISAF, and two Dutch naval frigates were operating in the region. The Netherlands has a tanker based in Qatar and C-130 transports in the region. There were plans to deploy Dutch F-16 fighters and a C-130 to Kyrgyzstan in July. Spain deployed two frigates and a logistics ship to the region, as well as two C-130s and helicopters in Kyrgyzstan. Spanish maritime patrol aircraft were flying missions from the French base in Djibouti. Greece had a frigate in the region and an engineering company in Kabul. Greece, Belgium, and Portugal contributed transport aircraft and other assets to ISAF.

49. Among the new allies, Poland deployed combat engineers and logistics forces to Bagram Air Base, a contingent of 275 troops that included chemical and biological weapons specialists and elite Polish commando forces. The Czech Republic in mid-April had more than 250 troops in Kuwait awaiting further deployment. Most are chemical and biological weapons specialists who will be responsible for protecting command headquarters against WMD attack.

#### **D. CONTRIBUTIONS BY NON-NATO COUNTRIES**

50. Equally important to the war on terrorism has been the contributions of countries outside of NATO. Some countries, particularly other US allies, have made significant contributions of military forces to the Afghanistan campaign. The role of the countries of Central Asia has been extremely important in that campaign, giving coalition forces bases from which to operate against al-Qaeda and the Taliban. And other countries have contributed by sharing intelligence or in other unpublicised ways. Of course, international co-operation has gone far beyond military assistance, as is discussed in the reports by the other committees of the Assembly.

51. One of the most important contributors has been Russia. On September 11, Russian President Vladimir Putin was the first foreign leader to telephone President Bush to offer condolences. Since then, Russia has provided both political and technical support for US operations, drawing on its long and sometimes unhappy experience in Afghanistan, including the Soviet invasion and occupation of the 1980s. Russia also assented to an American and allied presence in the former Soviet republics of Central Asia, which was critical to the operation. Much of this co-operation is due to Russian concerns about terrorism originating to its south.

52. In return, NATO has increased its co-operation with Russia. At this writing, the Alliance was in the process of formalising a new Russia-NATO Council that was aimed at giving Russia an equal voice with the other 19 NATO members. These plans were to be finalised at a summit meeting in Italy in late May. NATO's new relations with Russia are discussed in more detail in the general report of the Political Committee by Markus Meckel.

53. Russia has been particularly active in cooperating with the United States and the coalition in the area of intelligence sharing. In March Russia hosted a meeting of representatives from intelligence services of 39 countries to discuss the role of intelligence in the war on terrorism. Mr Putin called intelligence services the "first line of a struggle without compromise," and Nikolai Patruchev, the head of Russian foreign intelligence, proclaimed the conference "a new page in the history of relations among intelligence services."

54. Russia provided \$45 million (€51 million) in weapons to the Afghan anti-Taliban forces early in the campaign, and Moscow has been active in assisting humanitarian aid to Afghanistan. Russia has donated hundreds of thousands of tons of food and medicine, as well as emergency shelter and generators. Russia has also helped build a pontoon bridge from Tajikistan into Afghanistan and opened a tunnel enabling transport between northern and southern Afghanistan.

55. The role of the Central Asian countries has also been essential to the success of Operation Enduring Freedom. NATO and the US military had established links to these countries during the

1990s in the Partnership for Peace and through bilateral military-to-military contacts, most notably in Uzbekistan, where the United States offered training and non-lethal equipment to the Uzbek military. Those contacts allowed the United States to reach agreement quickly with Uzbekistan in October 2001 to deploy American forces to the country, the most populous in Central Asia. The air base at Karshi-Khanabad, known as K2 to American commanders, is reportedly hosting 2,000 US military personnel about 150 km north of the Afghan border. As noted above, Kyrgyzstan has given coalition forces, most notably those of France, access to its air base at Manas, and Tajikistan has allowed the coalition to use the airport at Dushanbe. A CRS report states that the United States is building a base near the Kyrgyz capital of Bishkek.

56. For Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan, the US-led war on terrorism offered the possibility of assistance in defeating their own terrorist insurgencies by groups claiming to be based on fundamentalist Islam. However, none of those countries is a functioning democracy, and the human rights record of Uzbekistan especially is a cause for concern. Human rights organisations have noted that Uzbek President Islam Karimov is using the Islamic insurgency in his country to crack down on all forms of opposition. The US State Department has stated that “arbitrary arrest and detention of Muslim believers is common” and that torture is used, and Human Rights Watch reports that 7,000 Muslims have been arbitrarily imprisoned in Uzbekistan. While the assistance of the Central Asian countries is vital to the campaign in Afghanistan, the United States and other coalition partners cannot in the long term turn a blind eye to the human rights violations and disregard for democracy there.

57. The assistance of the countries of South Asia has also been critical to the success of Operation Enduring Freedom. Pakistan is the most significant, as overflight rights granted to coalition forces enabled the first air attacks from the Arabian Sea against al-Qaeda and Taliban targets in Afghanistan. Pakistan has also provided basing rights to coalition aircraft at four air bases. However, Pakistan’s support has been inconsistent, particular its control of its border with Afghanistan, across which many al-Qaeda and Taliban fighters are thought to have sought refuge.

58. India has also offered use of its territory and military facilities for the war on terrorism, as well as sharing intelligence. The United States and India have stepped up exchanges and offered each other access to intelligence databases to facilitate investigations and cut off terrorist funding.

59. The countries of the Persian Gulf region have also extended needed assistance to coalition forces, most notably basing and overflight rights. As touched on in the previous section, US and coalition forces are using army and air bases in Kuwait. Qatar has granted use of its large al-Udeid base. Bahrain is home to the US navy’s Fifth Fleet, and coalition naval forces have used facilities there. Oman has granted access to US forces to its bases, and the United Kingdom has used Oman as a staging area for its forces in the region. Saudi Arabia has been reluctant to publicise its contribution for political regions, but it is home to the largest US air force operations centre in the region. Co-operation with Gulf countries is significant, but one challenge is that they are located too far from Afghanistan for short-range tactical aircraft to be based there.

60. NATO candidate countries have also been active in the war on terrorism. Romania has offered ground troops to the coalition, including a company from its elite Mountain Battalion, but no combat forces are currently deployed. Romania is to deploy an infantry battalion and a company for anti-nuclear, biological and chemical warfare to Afghanistan in July 2002. In addition, Romania has deployed a military police platoon and a C-130 transport for ISAF.

61. Six US tankers have been based at the Bulgarian air base at Burgas, flying from there to the Caspian Sea to refuel coalition aircraft flying into Afghanistan. Bulgaria has also pledged 40 troops to ISAF. Among other candidate countries, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania each planned to send 10 personnel as part of the air-movement control team within the Danish contingent in Kyrgyzstan.

They were to deploy in May 2002. Also, a handful of Lithuanian medical personnel were to deploy in September 2002 as part of a Czech field hospital. Slovenia is sending a company to the SFOR mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina to free up other allied personnel. Among other Partnership for Peace countries, Austria is contributing more than 30 troops to ISAF; Finland has almost 50 troops in ISAF engaged in civil-military co-operation; and Sweden has 29 troops in ISAF. The role of Georgia is discussed in more detail in the next chapter.

62. The role of other US allies has been important as well. Most notably, Australia has committed more than 1,500 troops to the coalition effort, including 150 troops from the elite Special Air Services, some of whom took part in Operation Anaconda. Australia has also offered fighter, transport, tanker and surveillance aircraft, as well as two naval ships. Japan pledged 1,500 troops to the war on terrorism after passage of a law in October 2001 permitted such operations. The Japanese navy is providing six ships to gather intelligence, transport supplies, and refuel other coalition ships.

63. The broad support that the United States has received since September 11 is truly appreciated by the US Congress and the American people. In particular, your Rapporteur notes the contributions of the NATO allies in fulfilment of their collective-defence declaration. The role that allied forces have played on the ground in Afghanistan, in the skies overhead, and in the naval fleet stationed in the region have made a concrete and needed contribution to Operation Enduring Freedom and the war on terrorism. While this operation is not being directed by NATO headquarters, the contributions of the NATO allies show that Article 5 remains at the core of NATO, and the Alliance has an essential role to play as we face new security challenges.

#### **IV. NEXT STEPS IN THE WAR AGAINST TERRORISM**

64. The campaign against al-Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan has gone well for the coalition against terrorism, but as of this writing, it is not yet over. Al-Qaeda and Taliban fighters remain in the mountains of eastern Afghanistan, and while their infrastructure and support network have been destroyed and disrupted, they remain capable of inflicting casualties on coalition forces. After Operation Anaconda was completed in late March, Gen. Tommy Franks, commander-in-chief of US Central Command, warned that it was not the last major ground operation in the campaign, saying, "Future operations are likely to be the same size as Anaconda." He noted that future operations in Afghanistan might involve different combinations of US and coalition forces.

65. Still, since the Taliban was driven from power in Afghanistan in December 2001, there has been much discussion about the next phase of the war on terrorism. Steve Hadley, the deputy national security adviser to President Bush, offered this Committee a view of the desired end-state when he said, "We'll know it's over when the terrorism stops." General DeLong, the deputy commander-in-chief of Central Command, said: "The idea is that if you have [terrorism] in your country, get rid of it. If you have the will but don't have the capability, ask the coalition for help. If you don't have the will, we may have to help you anyway. But as a result of Afghanistan, most countries we're talking to are inviting the coalition in." Terrorism will always pose a problem that we must continue to fight, but success in this campaign can cripple the ability of terrorists to wreak massive death and destruction on our nations and our people.

66. US officials who met with the Committee in Washington and Tampa in January 2002 said that the second phase in the fight against terrorism was getting underway, with US military advisers about to be deployed to the Philippines to help that country defeat terrorism. They said similar assistance could be provided to Yemen and Sudan, and an anti-terrorist campaign might be imposed on Somalia, which lacks a strong central government that could request assistance.

67. The 660-strong US contingent in the Philippines deployed in February to the southern island of Basilan to conduct a six-month exercise with 3,800 Filipino troops. The US contingent includes 160 special forces personnel who are to assist with training of Filipino forces in counter-insurgency operations, especially intelligence. The United States has also promised about \$100 million (€115 million) in equipment to the armed forces of the Philippines. American forces are not to engage in combat during the exercise. Islands in the southern Philippines have been the home of a long-running Islamic insurgency, and the Abu Sayyev terrorist group is believed to have provided logistical help to al-Qaeda. Abu Sayyev's operations are centred on Basilan and the neighbouring island of Jolo.

68. Somalia suffers from a lack of an effective central government, which makes it an inviting target for terrorist groups, though reports indicate that the various clans that rule regions of the country are distrustful of outsiders and unlikely to offer them refuge. While there are believed to be several terrorist camps in Somalia, a report by the International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) in London cites US intelligence sources as saying that there has been no significant activity there since September 11. US intelligence is reported to be working with clan leaders in Somalia and Ethiopian officials to gain intelligence on al-Qaeda presence in Somalia. After the Taliban fell from power in Afghanistan, there was some concern that al-Qaeda might attempt to relocate to Somalia, and coalition naval forces have been actively patrolling sea lanes between Pakistan and Somalia to interdict any terrorists who might seek refuge. The United States was reported to have three Marine Expeditionary Units in the Arabian Sea, which could be deployed should military action be necessary in Somalia.

69. Military action appears unlikely in Sudan or Yemen, both of which are reported to be cooperating with the United States in the war on terrorism. Secretary of State Colin Powell said the intelligence relationship with Sudan "has been very cooperative," which is particularly useful because the country was home to bin Laden from 1991 to 1996. Yemen in March 2002 accepted "several hundred" US special forces troops to serve as advisers to its military. Yemen is reported to be cooperating with US intelligence and in investigating the bombing attack on the USS Cole in the Yemeni port of Aden. A December 2001 offensive by Yemeni forces against suspected al-Qaeda terrorists did not lead to any terrorists being captured, but US officials consider that Yemen is making a good-faith effort to combat terrorism.

70. US forces are also helping Georgia combat terrorism. The United States in February 2002 announced plans to deploy about 200 specialists to train Georgian armed forces, particularly in counter-terrorism operations, and to provide helicopters. They were to arrive in late April. Georgia faces a terrorist threat from Islamic extremists in its Pankisi Gorge region, a rocky, forested area near the Russian-Georgian border described as "a hotbed of kidnapping, drugs and arms smuggling," as well as home to rebels from the neighbouring region of Chechnya in Russia. Georgian officials say there are dozens of Afghan and Arab fighters in the gorge, which Russian defence minister Sergei Ivanov has called "a mini-Afghanistan on Russia's doorstep." Russian officials initially expressed criticism of the deployment of American troops to the former Soviet republic, but President Vladimir Putin himself reacted calmly to the announcement.

71. During his State of the Union address in January, President Bush linked Iraq, Iran and North Korea into an "axis of evil." In off-the-record discussions with this Committee immediately after that speech, US officials emphasized that the countries were linked by their record of proliferating weapons of mass destruction, but no military action against all three is imminent. Prior to that speech, Mr Hadley had noted that there was "some circumstantial evidence" linking Iraq to the Sept. 11 attacks, but he emphasized that US concerns about Iraq are broader. "We are confident that Iraq is developing weapons of mass destruction, and they're shooting at our aircraft. We're going to turn to Iraq in due course," he said.

72. Since then, there has been no indication that the United States plans military action against either North Korea or Iran, though American officials have continued to criticise their efforts to obtain and proliferate weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles. These activities are examined in more detail in the Committee's general report.

73. As for Iraq, UN Security Council Resolution 687 calls for a verified end to Iraqi WMD programmes. Baghdad's continued refusal to permit weapons inspections leaves little doubt that Saddam Hussein is continuing his efforts to develop nuclear, biological and chemical weapons, in defiance of arms control treaties and the UN. The possibility of Saddam successfully obtaining these weapons and sharing them with terrorist groups is one of the gravest threats to the security of the NATO countries. US and British officials are reported to be compiling evidence of Saddam's WMD programmes, but British officials declined to release a dossier on the programmes in early April, as had been announced. Iraq in mid-April postponed talks with the UN on the return of inspectors, who must have full and immediate access to any Iraqi facility that they suspect is being used in a WMD programme. The diplomatic dance in which Iraq is engaged is a means to undercut international support for military action to deal with the threat of Iraqi WMD, without offering any likelihood that Saddam will accept free and unfettered inspections of his nuclear, biological and chemical weapons facilities.

74. No direct link between Saddam and the September 11 attacks has been established, though there have been reports that the leader of the hijackers and an Iraqi intelligence official met in Prague in April 2001. In addition, defectors from Iraqi intelligence agencies said that Iraq has operated a secret terrorist training camp since 1995, with simulated hijackings as part of the training regimen using a Boeing 707 fuselage.

75. American and British officials are firm in their statements that no decision has been made on whether to take military action against Iraq. The idea has generated opposition among the European allies and is particularly controversial in the United Kingdom, where Prime Minister Tony Blair has indicated support should the United States take action to change the regime in Baghdad. Members of Mr Blair's own Labour Party, as well as the opposition Liberal Democrats, have openly confronted the prime minister over the issue, asking that he agree not to take military action against Iraq unless the United Nations authorises such a step. German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder has also stated that a UN resolution would be needed before Germany would participate in any action against Iraq. François Bujon, the French ambassador to Washington, has declared that the Americans "would be on their own" against Iraq.

76. If the United States were to decide to attack Iraq and replace the regime of Saddam Hussein, with or without the support of allies, President Bush would have to decide among several options. At one extreme is a full military invasion along the lines of Operation Desert Storm, which drove Iraqi forces from Kuwait in 1991. While Saudi Arabia has indicated that it would not permit its territory to be used in such an offensive, it is possible that Turkey might agree to let American forces use its territory to depose Saddam. Analysts differ on the forces required for such an offensive. Kenneth Pollack, a former National Security Council official writing in the March/April 2002 issue of Foreign Affairs, estimates that 200,000 to 300,000 personnel would be required – four to six ground divisions plus support, 700 to 1,000 aircraft, and one to five carrier battle groups, depending on the availability of bases. He estimates a force build-up would take three to five months, and the operation itself about a month.

77. At the other extreme is an effort to encourage Iraqi opposition groups to rise up and overthrow Saddam. Some experts like Richard Perle, head of the Defence Science Board, a Pentagon advisory panel, argue that "organising a resistance to Saddam would not be difficult," given how the dictator is despised in his own country. Mr Perle argues that American support could give Iraqi opposition groups the cohesion and resources needed to topple Saddam. Critics

of this support argue that Saddam's ruthlessness and the unfortunate history of failed rebellions against him mean that indigenous opposition is unlikely to precipitate Saddam's collapse. Writing in the March/April 2002 issue of *Foreign Policy*, where he is senior editor, Mark Strauss argues that "Victory against the Iraqi regime depends upon mass uprisings and defections, yet it is uncertain that such popular unrest will occur without victory.

78. In the middle would be an approach similar to that used in Afghanistan, where intense and precision-guided US (and allied) air strikes were used in conjunction with a small number of special operations forces on the ground working together with indigenous ground forces opposed to the ruling regime. Some analysts have suggested that the Kurdish opposition in the north of the country and the Shiite Muslim community in the south could provide such a ground force with US assistance, much as the Northern Alliance did in Iraq. Others, like Michael O'Hanlon and Philip Gordon of the Brookings Institution, argue that this approach would be insufficient because opposition forces are weak and air power would be unable to destroy Iraqi armoured forces that would likely be hidden inside urban areas of central Iraq.

79. At the same time, we must concern ourselves with what Iraq will look like after Saddam is removed from power. The European allies, in particular, raise the very legitimate concern that a defeated Iraq may be weak and fragmented, leading to greater instability in the region. Experts caution that with Iraq removed as a strong counterweight, Iran would become the dominant state of the Persian Gulf region. The collapse of the Iraqi state could also lead to the Kurds in northern Iraq declaring an independent state, a development that would be of great concern to Turkey, which has its own large Kurdish minority. While the removal of Saddam is without doubt a desirable prospect, we must ensure that it does not generate a host of new problems.

80. It is clear, though, that Iraq's intransigence in refusing to abide by UN resolutions mandating arms inspections indicate that the regime has something to hide. Saddam had sought nuclear, biological and chemical weapons before the Persian Gulf War, and the absence of weapons inspectors for nearly four years means that there is nothing inside Iraq to stop him. It is likely that Saddam is in violation of UN Security Council Resolution 687, posing a grave threat to international security. The threat of Iraq successfully developing WMD must be addressed, and this Committee should continue to monitor this situation.

## ***V. NATO'S ROLE IN FIGHTING TERRORISM***

81. In the wake of September 11, all countries in the North Atlantic Alliance must rethink what it means to defend our countries and our people. Several NATO countries are already taking steps to improve their capabilities to meet future campaigns against terrorism. In the United States, President Bush has requested that the Congress appropriate an additional \$48 billion (€55 billion) for defence, much of which will be used to combat terrorism. Included in that amount is a 21% increase in the budget for special operations forces that were so critical to success in Afghanistan. In the United Kingdom, Defence Secretary Geoff Hoon has initiated a new chapter in the 1998 Strategic Defence Review to examine new needs in the wake of September 11. Among changes being proposed are the creation of elite rapid response teams that could be deployed quickly to carry out strikes against terrorist targets. Mr Hoon has requested an additional £1 billion (\$1.4 billion, €1.6 billion) to improve British capabilities.

82. NATO itself must also transform its institutions and capabilities to play a role in counter-terrorism operations. Secretary General Robertson has already declared that the November summit in Prague will be the "transformation summit," at which NATO will decide how it will address the broad range of security challenges facing it today. NATO, of course, already identified terrorism as a threat to its security in the 1999 Strategic Concept. But the Alliance must do more.



NATO must embrace fighting terrorism as one of its primary missions. As Senator Joseph Biden, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and Senator Richard Lugar, soon to become the senior Republican on the committee, have noted, "NATO should declare that the threats to our territory and interests can come from beyond Europe – and that the Alliance is prepared to respond to them by acting beyond Europe."

83. Senator Lugar noted that NATO is "the natural defence arm of the trans-Atlantic community and the institution we should turn to for help in meeting new challenges, such as terrorism and weapons of mass destruction. ... The most critical issue facing our nations today ... is the war on terrorism. NATO has to decide whether it wants to participate in this war. It has to decide whether it wants to be relevant in addressing the major security challenge of our day."

84. NATO has already taken the first steps in this direction. At their meeting in December 2001, the foreign ministers of the Alliance announced that a new analysis of the terrorism threat is being prepared and steps being taken to deal with the possibility of WMD terrorism and the implications of terrorism for force planning. The ministers indicated that future work will include a military concept for defence against terrorism once the threat analysis is completed and a review of the Alliance's defence and military policies, structures and capabilities in light of the terrorist threat. The ministers also called for enhanced intelligence and threat assessment sharing.

85. Some outside analysts have offered ideas in this regard. Philip Gordon of Brookings has cited the role of the NATO WMD Centre and the Alliance's civil defence and consequence-management planning as areas for additional focus. Tomas Valasek, a senior analyst at the Centre for Defence Information, has called for NATO's Defence Planning Group to make terrorism a high priority and to look for ways of augmenting the Alliance's collective skills.

86. Others have called for the Alliance to play a direct role in generating forces to combat terrorism and states that sponsor it wherever they may be. Stanley Sloan, director of the Atlantic Community Initiative and a former Rapporteur for this Assembly, has called for NATO to create a Counter Terrorism Combined Joint Task Force (CJTf), drawing on the CJTF structure that the Alliance adopted at its 1996 Berlin Summit and has since proven in exercises. The CJTF concept is intended to enable coalitions of the willing to take military action and provides a NATO framework for out-of-area operations. It enables non-NATO countries to participate in a coalition of the willing, and it is flexible enough to allow whatever command structure might be needed for a given operation, which the campaign in Afghanistan shows is necessary for an effective military campaign. Mr Sloan's idea calls for participating countries to indicate what forces and capabilities they might want to contribute to a Counter Terrorism CJTF, enabling NATO to serve as a clearing house for existing and future allied contributions to the war on terrorism.

87. Franklin Kramer, a former US assistant secretary of defence, has proposed that NATO develop a military expeditionary capability to enable it to operate outside of Europe to combat threats to the Alliance. Building on existing structures like the ACE Rapid Reaction Corps (ARRC), this Allied Expeditionary Force would offer a complement to existing capabilities possessed by individual allies. Mr Kramer further proposes that a joint NATO-Russia brigade be established within this expeditionary force, formally bringing Russia into the military command structure, much as the NATO-Russia Council will give Russia a political voice in certain areas at NATO.

88. Several other analysts have focused on the need for the European allies, in particular, to improve their capabilities for power projection and counter-terrorism operations like those being undertaken in Afghanistan. Many of these are part of NATO's Defence Capabilities Initiative, which is examined in the general report. Particularly relevant for fighting terrorism are special operations forces, which were so critical to the campaign in Afghanistan, and the Alliance must be able to coordinate activities of special forces from different countries. The allies must also be

prepared to share intelligence information to a greater extent than before. Most importantly, allies must consider funding increases in their defence budgets to enable them to close the growing capabilities gap in NATO.

## **VI. CONCLUSION**

89. The terrorist attacks of September 11 demonstrated that the NATO nations face new and insidious threats to their nations, to their people, and to their way of life. The Alliance responded forcefully to this attack, invoking Article 5 of the Washington Treaty and thereby asserting that the attacks on one ally constituted an attack on them all. The allies have backed this declaration with concrete contributions of military capability, assisting the multinational campaign that drove the illegitimate Taliban regime from power in Afghanistan and destroyed the sanctuary of the al-Qaeda terrorist network. Their contributions, and those of partners from outside the North Atlantic Alliance, are greatly appreciated by the US Congress and the American people.

90. The campaign in Afghanistan has been successful, but as long as terrorists there maintain the capability of harming our forces, it cannot be considered completed. And the broader war on terrorism has far to go. Already, governments in places like the Philippines, Yemen, Sudan and Georgia are working with the United States to eliminate the terrorists in their midst. As the campaign moves forward, we must think about how to deal with Iraq, which continues to defy United Nations resolutions calling for it to abandon its programmes to develop weapons of mass destruction and for UN inspectors to verify this. The possibility that the Iraqi regime, a state sponsor of terrorism, might provide nuclear, biological or chemical weapons to a terrorist group that would use them against us constitutes the gravest threat to the Alliance today. This may well lead us to the conclusion that the only way to protect our people is to use military force to remove Saddam Hussein from power.

91. Given the terrorist threat to the Alliance, NATO must transform itself to deal with this threat. The Alliance must consider developing its own capability to deploy a force outside of the Euro-Atlantic region to combat terrorists and the regimes that support them, particularly given that most member states would be unable to plan and execute such a campaign without relying on the resources and capabilities of the Alliance. At the same time, individual allies must recommit themselves to carrying out the Defence Capabilities Initiative so that they can deploy and sustain forces wherever in the world they are needed and so that they can continue to operate technologically with American forces. And we must use the new relationship with Russia to ensure that its nuclear, biological and chemical weapons and materials are securely safeguarded.

92. The war against terrorism promises to be a long, hard struggle. It is a war that will be fought on many fronts other than the military one. But it is a war in which NATO has a critical role to play, and the NATO allies must declare that terrorism is one of the gravest threats to the Alliance today. Working together, this is a war that we can, we must, and we will win.

---